

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,104	07/23/2003	Michio Ohkubo	01ZS-105709	8989	
30764	7590 04/29/2005		EXAM	INER	
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP 333 SOUTH HOPE STREET			VAN ROY, TO	VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS	
48TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGELI	ES, CA 90071-1448		2828		
			DATE MAILED: 04/29/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/626,104	OHKUBO ET AL.	(gn)			
Office Action Summary	Examiner A	Art Unit	<u> </u>			
	Tod T. Van Roy	2828				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, or lif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ron. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commit ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.					
• — • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers	,					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-15 	52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/626,104

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 7 line 26 reads "to form a near field pattern" and the reader is then referred to see figure 2. This is confusing in that pg.8 lines 6-7 also disclose elements of figure 2 as being in the far field. It is thus believed that the line "to form a near field pattern" should read "to form a far field pattern", or elements of figure 2 should only be referred to with regard to near field or far field and not both.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6618417.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from

Art Unit: 2828

each other because the claims in the current application are broader than the claims of patent '417 and hence '417 then outlines an existing embodiment of the claims of the application under review.

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6560260 in view of Hayashi et al. (US 5960019). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the current application are broader than the claims of patent '260 and hence '260 then outlines an existing embodiment of the claims of the application under review with the exception that '260 does not disclose the ridge waveguide semiconductor laser diode to comprise facets. Hayashi et al. (US 5960019) teaches the use of facets in a semiconductor laser device (col.11 line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine the ridge waveguide device of '260 with the facets of Hayashi in order to provide feedback and form a cavity suitable for proper laser oscillation.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5022036 and US 5394424 that speak of changing output beam characteristics via changes in upper cladding thickness.

Art Unit: 2828

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tod T. Van Roy whose telephone number is (571)272-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun Harvey can be reached on (571)272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVR

MINSUN CHUMPYTY
PRIMADIA TRANSPORTE